## CRIMINAL DOCKET UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

TITLE OF CASE	ATTORNEYS
THE UNITED STATES	For U.S.:
vs.	Nathan G. Graham, U.S. Atty. Hubert H. Bryant, Asst. US A
	For Defendant:
JEANNIE COLLEEN WISEMAN	Fred Woodson -for (Retained Don E. Gasaway 1843 E. 15th Tulsa, Okla. 74104

GMAMIGMICAL DECORD	COSTS	DATE	NAME OR	REC.	DISB.
STATISTICAL RECORD	COSTS	DATE	RECEIPT NO.	ABC.	DISB.
J.S. 2 mailed 9-30-71	Clerk				
J.S. 3 mailed 9-30-7/	Marshal				
Violation Stole & Embezzle 45 Cases of Beer	d Docket fee				
Title 18					
Sec. U.S.C., 659					

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
9-24-71 9-24-71	Information filed in Open Court. v Arraignment of Jeannie Colleen Wiseman. Waived going before U.S. Judge and consented to be tried before the U.S. Magistrate.  Deferred Sentencing.  Placed on Probation for a period of Six (6) Months.  SHe is to reimburse the Railroad in the amount of \$27.00 within Five (5) days from today.  Probation Officer will report after the first of the year the Deft.'s
9-24-71 9-24-71 1-7-72	Conduct. (MLB-Mag) v Judgment and order of probation, filed and entered. v Two copies of J & O sent to Probation Office. v Order & report terminating probation prior to original expiration date, filed. MLB-Mag.)g

DATE	PRO	CEEDINGS		
·			•	

## UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE

NORTHERN

DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA



## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS—TRIAL OF MINOR OFFENSE\*

BEFORE Morris L. Bradford	U. S.	Court House, Tulsa	a, Oklahoma
(Name of magistrate)	NO. AND NO. 160 NO. 200 NO. 20	(Address)	
MAGISTRATE'S  DOCKET NO. 1 CASE NO. 132  THE UNITED STATES  VS.  JEANNIE COLLEEN WISEMAN  WARRANTS ISSUED: Date September 13, 1971  for (name of defendant) Substance of return Executed by	Information dated on oath of Hubert H. charging violation of USC  at Tulsa, Oklahoma division of Norther as follows: Did embez: from a Southern Paci oz. aluminum cans Coc shipment of freight lleen Wiseman to (name y arrest of Jeannie (	Title 18, Section  July 17  on July 17  district of Section  zle, steal, take and fic railroad car 4	0klahoma nd carry away cases of 12
Date for (name of defendant) Substance of return	to (name o	of officer)	
Date for (name of defendant) Substance of return	to (name o	of officer)	
TRIAL:  Date_ September 24, 1971 A	United S	States - Rubert H. Bi	ryant ahoma Gasaway
PROCEEDINGS TAKEN: On 9/13/71, a On arraignment of \$1,000 and bond in amount of \$1,000 and Defendant was advised of rig	ccused was advised of released. ht to be tried in Di	f chai <del>ldes</del> and execu	uted a personal
arraignment proceedings such as "defendant informed of ch Consent to be Tried Before M	arge, right to trial in district court, right agistrate.	to counsel," "defendant filed written	consent to be tried before
nagistrate," etc.			
On arraignment, the Defendant pleade WITNESSES FOR THE UNITED STATES: Name	not guilty. Address		
Name ————————————————————————————————————	Address		
*Use this form when acting by special designation			

WITNESSES FOR DEFI		
	stimony:	
Name	Address	**************************************
	stimony:	
	DENCE INTRODUCED AS FOLLOWS: (Here describe the documents and summarize	
The judgment	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/not guilty/other	
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/not/guilty/otker  pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follow
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$  Defendant was place	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/not/guilty/other pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follow
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$  Defendant was place	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/net/guilty/otker pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71, as follov
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$  Defendant was place,,,	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/not/guilty/other pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follov
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$  Defendant was place,,,	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/not/guilty/other pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follov
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$  Defendant was place,,,	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/net/guilty/otker pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follow
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$  Defendant was place,,,, by (name) (name)	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/net/guilty/otker pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follow
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$  Defendant was place,,,, by (name) Cash bail depositions	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty not guilty other pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follow
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$  Defendant was place,,,, by (name) Cash bail depositions	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/net/guilty/otker pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follow
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty not guilty other pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follow , 19 and , 19
The judgment The sentence up a fine of \$	of the magistrate was that the defendant was/guilty/int with the pon judgment of guilty was imposed on	71 , as follow , 19 and , 19

FPI MI-2-12-71-100M-5935